

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Applicant's amendment filed on December 15, 2009.
2. Claims 1, 11 and 22-23 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-29 are pending.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

4. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Anthony Jones (Reg. No. 59,521) on 01/04/09.

The application has been amended as follows:

In the claims:

Please amend claim 11 and 22 as follows:

Claim 11:

A computer readable storage medium for storing instructions that, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to perform a method of preventing an endnode in a communication fabric from receiving an unauthorized communication, comprising:

establishing a first category of management communications to include:

- a request from a manager node to an endnode; and
- a reply from the manager node to a request from an endnode;

establishing a second category of management communications to include:

- a reply from an endnode to a request from the manager node; and
- a request from an endnode to the manager node; and
- at a switching device coupled to a first endnode:

receiving from the communication fabric a management communication addressed to the first endnode;

determining whether the first endnode is a trusted endnode;

determining whether the management communication is a first category management communication; and

responsive to the first endnode not being a trusted endnode and the management communication not being a first category management communication, discarding the management communication.

Claim 22

A computer readable storage medium for storing instructions that, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to perform a method of preventing an endnode in a communication fabric from sending an unauthorized communication, comprising:

establishing a first category of management communications to include:

a request from a manager node to an endnode; and

a reply from the manager node to a request from an endnode;

establishing a second category of management communications to include:

a reply from an endnode to a request from the manager node; and

a request from an endnode to the manager node; and

at a switching device coupled to a first endnode:

receiving from a first endnode a management communication addressed to a second endnode in the communication fabric;

determining whether the first endnode is a trusted endnode;

determining whether the management communication is a second category management communication based; and

responsive to the first endnode not being a trusted endnode, discarding the management communication if the management communication is not a second category management communication.

Claim 29:

Claim 29 has been canceled.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-28 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art on record:

Gai et al. (US 2004/0160903) teaches a method for implementing security groups in an enterprise network wherein the received packet is classified as having a security group designation selected from a plurality of security group designations. The security group designation associating a set of destinations and a set of sources authorized to access the set of destinations. Applying a security group tag (SGT) to the packet which identifies the security group designation, the security tag being applied in a field not reserved for virtual local area network information. A group of client devices may communicate with the servers, but the client devices may not communicate with each other. This result can be achieved by using one SGT to tag packets originated by the servers and one SGT to tag packets originated by the client devices. SGTs are used for egress filtering and the number outside oval are SGT's used for ingress tagging.

Pinto (US 2002/0133622) teaches a method of discovering and mapping elements in a subnet of data network fabric. The subnet manager first formats the packet by setting the management class field to data which indicates a subnet management class direct route using node identifiers with broadcast. In order for the nodes on the subnet to be aware of the mechanism that is being used the management class field must be set to a value indicating a subnet management class using directed route with node identifiers. Thus, the subnet manger formats the packet by inserting this management class and by initializing the port path block and identifier path block to zeros.

Chou (US 6,920,106) teaches management packets are used to implement management functions and may include SMPs, Performance Management Packets, and Baseboard Management Packets. A virtual lane (VL) is reserved exclusively for sub-network management packets (SMPs).

With respect to claim 1:

The prior art on record either taken singularly or in combination fails to teach ***"establishing a first category of management communications to include: a request from a manager node to an endnode; and a reply from the manager node to a request from an endnode; establishing a second category of management communications to include a reply from an endnode to a request from the manager node; a request from an endnode to the manger node; and determining whether the management communication is a first category management communication; and responsive to the first endnode not being a trusted endnode***

and the management communication not being a first category management communication, discarding the management communication” including all the other limitations recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 11-12, 22 and 23 includes similar limitations are also allowed for the same reason set forth above.

Dependent claims 2-10, 13-21 and 24-28 are also allowed.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled “Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance.”

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEWAYE GELAGAY whose telephone number is (571)272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Shewaye Gelagay/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437